


Braille Monitor



JANUARY, 1983

VOICE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
National Federation of the Blind (NFB)

THE BRAILLE MONITOR

PUBLICATION OF THE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

JANUARY 1983

CONTENTS

ON THE LABOR FRONT: A SUPREME COURT VICTORY AND OTHER GOOD NEWS CONCERNING SHELTERED WORKSHOPS	1
IOWA COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND GETS NEW DIRECTOR: MORE SHENANIGANS, SAME BAD SHOW	5
FURTHER EVIDENCE OF DETERIORATING SERVICES AT THE IOWA COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND	10
by James Gashel	
DATA ON THE COST OF RECORDED MATERIAL PRODUCED BY NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	13
CONFLICT OF INTEREST: AN ILLINOIS RESOLUTION RESOLUTION 82-03	16
COMMENTS FROM RAY KURZWEIL	17
SCHOLARSHIPS OFFERED BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND	19
POSSIBLE NEW SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR AGENCIES SERVING THE BLIND	21
by James Gashel	
A PRESS RELEASE FROM MINNESOTA	23
BLIND PICKET WORKSHOP IN NASHVILLE	25
MORE PROGRESS FOR THE TENNESSEE VENDORS AS NFB HELPS TO WIN NEW RIGHTS	26
OF COURTESY AND SWIMMING CLASSES	29
RECIPE OF THE MONTH	31
by Ramona Walhof	
MONITOR MINIATURES	31

THE BRAILLE MONITOR

Published monthly in inkprint, Braille, and on talking-book discs by

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

KENNETH JERNIGAN, *President*

National Office
1800 Johnson Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21230

Letters for the President, address changes,
subscription requests, and orders for NFB literature,
articles for the *Monitor* and letters to the editor
should be sent to the National Office.

* * *

Monitor subscriptions cost the Federation about fifteen dollars per year. Members are invited, and non-members are requested, to cover the subscription cost. Donations should be made payable to **National Federation of the Blind** and sent to:

Richard Edlund, *Treasurer*
National Federation of the Blind
Box 11185
Kansas City, Kansas 66111

* * *

If you or a friend would like to remember the National Federation of the Blind in your will, you can do so by employing the following language:

"I give, devise, and bequeath unto National Federation of the Blind, a District of Columbia nonprofit corporation, the sum of \$____ (or "____percent of my net estate" or "the following stocks and bonds: ____") to be used for its worthy purposes on behalf of blind persons."

* * *

**THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND IS NOT AN ORGANIZATION
SPEAKING FOR THE BLIND—IT IS THE BLIND SPEAKING FOR THEMSELVES**

ISSN 0006-8829

ON THE LABOR FRONT: A SUPREME COURT VICTORY
AND OTHER GOOD NEWS CONCERNING
SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

On Monday, October 4, 1982, when the United States Supreme Court convened for its fall term, an historic event occurred for all blind people. It happened without fanfare or ceremony, just as if it were an everyday occurrence. But routine and ordinary it certainly was not.

The happening was the Supreme Court's decision not to overturn a lower court ruling which said that blind workers at the Cincinnati Association for the Blind have the right to collective bargaining. This decision, handed down on March 17, 1982, by the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was reported in the July issue of the *Monitor*. In rulings subsequent to the March 17 decision, the Court in the Sixth Circuit withheld enforcement of its bargaining order pending the outcome of an appeal by the Cincinnati Association for the Blind to the United States Supreme Court. That appeal is now over. The highest court in the land has declined to review the lower court's decision.

In plain terms, we have won! The Cincinnati Association may attempt once more to get the Supreme Court to hear the case. However, it is unlikely that the Court will change its mind. Meanwhile, the stage is in readiness for bargaining talks to begin. As we go to press with this issue of the *Monitor*, the Teamsters Union, Local 100 in Cincinnati, has scheduled Thursday,

November 4, as the opening day for contract negotiations. But the Association has not yet responded to indicate its next move. However, if good faith contract talks are refused, the Association could be assessed heavy fines (perhaps as much as \$1,500 per day) by the National Labor Relations Board.

The Supreme Court's decision not to hear the Cincinnati appeal means that collective bargaining rights for blind shop workers are one step closer to becoming the absolute law of the land. In reaching this conclusion, the principal question has been whether blind people in sheltered workshops are employees or rehabilitation clients. On this point, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals did not equivocate in its March 17 ruling. The Court rejected the argument of the Cincinnati Association that Congress intended the workers to be clients, not employees. This is now the controlling decision, at least in that part of the country covered by the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. But other federal courts will look to this decision for guidance and consider, as well, the Supreme Court's decision to let the opinion stand.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is next in line to pass judgment on the labor organizing issues. *Monitor* readers will remember that this

Court handed us a setback in August, 1981, when it ruled that the blind workers at the Lighthouse for the Blind of Houston were not covered by the National Labor Relations Act (see the *Braille Monitor* for December, 1981). This decision was directly opposite to the one reached by the Cincinnati Court. In September, 1981, the National Labor Relations Board asked the Houston court to reconsider its decision. The decision was handed down in mid-June of 1982. This was another victory! The court vacated (set aside) its August 1981 decision and ordered an entirely new hearing before a three-judge panel. That hearing was held in mid-October of 1982, and a new decision is pending. While no one, of course, can predict the outcome, it is clear that the decision of the Cincinnati court, now upheld by the Supreme Court, will carry considerable weight.

Meanwhile, there is other good news from Arkansas. In the summer of 1981, the blind workers at the Arkansas Lighthouse for the Blind in Little Rock got the go-ahead from the National Labor Relations Board to have a union election. The order for the election came from the regional director of the National Labor Relations Board. That election was held on July 10, 1981, amid pressure tactics and maneuvering by Lighthouse management. Salary increases and other benefits were suggested if workers would vote against the union. The events immediately following the election (including wage increases and the firing of at least one union organizer) added to the evidence of unfair labor practices. Under the circumstances, it came with no surprise that the vote for the union lost by a narrow margin.

As we reported in a previous article (see the *Braille Monitor* for November, 1981), the charges of unfair labor practices were filed against the Lighthouse by Teamsters Local 878 in Little Rock. Subsequently,

the Lighthouse attorneys countered, as expected, by appealing to the five-member National Labor Relations Board in Washington. The basis for the appeal was the position that the regional director of the National Labor Relations Board should not have ordered an election in the first place. The argument was the old standard—the workers are not employees so the Lighthouse is not subject to the National Labor Relations Act. In part, this appeal was obviously a tactic of delay in order to forestall a hearing on the substance of the unfair labor practice charges. But more than that, the attorneys for the Lighthouse were undoubtedly placing their hopes in the new and more conservative members of the National Labor Relations Board appointed by President Reagan. Thus, we were back to the original issue (settled by the NLRB in Cincinnati and then in Houston) of whether blind workers in sheltered workshops for the blind could be represented by a labor union. The Little Rock appeal then became a major test to see if the National Labor Relations Board would reaffirm the Board's earlier decisions.

On August 5, 1982, by a vote of 4–1 (the chairman voting in the minority) the full Board upheld the precedent-setting decisions of Cincinnati and Houston by declaring that the blind workers at the Arkansas Lighthouse are employees entitled to protection under the National Labor Relations Act. This did not decide that these employees should or should not have a labor union. However, the Board's August 5 ruling did clear the way for a long-awaited hearing on the unfair labor practices of the Lighthouse at the time of the union election in 1981. As we go to press with this issue of the *Monitor*, the hearing is scheduled to occur in Little Rock in mid-November. If the unfair labor practice charges are upheld, the National Labor

Relations Board may order the Lighthouse to the bargaining table with the Teamsters Local 878, without the necessity of another election. Regardless of what happens, there is much encouragement in the fact that the full Board has again reconsidered and affirmed the position that workshops for the blind can properly fall under NLRB jurisdiction. The courts seem to be headed in the same direction.

1982 has, indeed, been a banner year in our struggle to achieve equal rights in sheltered workshops. Of course, our battles are not over by any means. We will need to file many more legal briefs and send our lawyers to more hearings. Even so, we are squarely on the road toward final victory.

From the very founding of the National Federation of the Blind in 1940, the commitment has remained unchanged. It has been repeatedly reaffirmed. It is simply this: We the blind will not tolerate second-class status or second-class treatment. This principle applies to sheltered workshops as much as to any other situation in our society. The opponents of the progress of the blind are well-known. Among them we find the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC), National Industries for the Blind (NIB), the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB), and their company union puppet group, the American Council of the Blind (ACB).

This combine, through its NAC standards, declares that sheltered workshops should obey the labor laws. But, when the National Labor Relations Board determined that these labor laws require union elections and collective bargaining in sheltered workshops for the blind, NAC and NIB protested the rulings in the federal courts. Will they now continue to fight the blind, now that the highest court in the land has upheld the right of blind workers to have unions, or will they join us in fight-

ing to enforce this right? We know the answer. These groups have no regard for "standards" or "accreditation," and apparently they have equal disregard for the law.

The tide of change continues to rise ever higher. The old ways and customs are being washed away as useless debris from a dying age. Gradually, but steadily, ancient custodialism is giving way to the modern philosophy of equal rights and first-class status for the blind. This is the purpose of our movement. Cincinnati, Houston, and Arkansas are a lesson, a warning, and a promise.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Region 9

3003 Federal Office Building

550 Main Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

**Telephone: (513) 684-3663
684-3692**

October 21, 1982

**Response requested by
November 4, 1982**

Mr. Stephen S. Eberly
Attorney at Law
Dinsmore, Shohl, Coates & Deupree
2100 Fountain Square Plaza
511 Walnut Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

**Re: Cincinnati Association for the Blind
Case No. 9-CA-12914.**

Dear Mr. Eberly:

Since your petition for writ of certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States on October 4, 1982, the case has been assigned to me for compliance.

Enclosed are 10 copies of the Notice to

Employees required by the Board Order, as enforced. The Notices should be signed and dated by a responsible official of the Company, a sufficient number should be posted in accordance with the attached posting instructions, and three signed and dated copies should be returned to this office with a covering letter stating where and when the Notices were posted.

At the expiration of the posting period, it will be necessary to notify this office, in writing, that the Notices remained continuously and conspicuously posted for the required 60 days.

The Board Order, as enforced, provides that the Company will, upon request, bargain with Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Local Union No. 100, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. If and when the Union requests bargaining sessions, please keep a record of all relevant correspondence and memoranda and keep this office advised, in writing, as to the progress of such negotiations.

We anticipate the Court will provide for the recovery of costs incurred by the Board in seeking enforcement of its Order. Upon notification by the Court as to the costs awarded, I will contact you immediately.

If and when all the affirmative terms of the Board Order, as enforced, have been fully complied with and there are no reported violations of its negative provisions, you will be notified that the case has been closed on compliance.

As you know, the NLRB will consider possible contempt action whenever a respondent fails to timely comply with an enforcing judgment.

Please notify this office, in writing, on or before November 4, 1982, as to what steps

the Company has undertaken to comply with the Board Order, as enforced.

Very truly yours,
William A. Molony
Compliance Supervisor

Enclosures

cc:

Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers,
Local Union No. 100, affiliated with the
International Brotherhood of Teamsters,
Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers
of America
2100 Oak Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241

Jonas Katz, Attorney
6 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Parks and Logothetis
111 West First Street, Suite 1100
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Bert N. Bisgyer, Attorney
Weinberg and Green
Suite 600, 1110 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Roderick DeArment, Attorney
Covington & Burling
888 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

Posted Pursuant to
a Judgment of the
United States Court of Appeals

Enforcing an Order of the
National Labor Relations Board

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment with Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Local Union No. 100, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, and as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT, in any like or related manner, interfere with, restrain or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All production and maintenance employees and clients, including shipping

and receiving employees of the Employer's workshop located at 2045 Gilbert Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

Employer: Cincinnati Association for the Blind

Dated:

Signed by:

(Responsible Official--Title)

**THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE
AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE**

This notice must remain posted for 60 consecutive days from the date of posting and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. Any questions concerning this notice or compliance with its provisions may be directed to the Board's Office, 3003 Federal Office Building, 550 Main Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Telephone (513) 684-3663.

IOWA COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND GETS NEW DIRECTOR:

MORE SHENANIGANS, SAME BAD SHOW

As *Monitor* readers know, John Taylor was fired as director of the Iowa Commission for the Blind in the spring of 1982. This followed four years of unbelievable mismanagement and ineptitude—conduct which had brought strife and dissension to the staff of the Commission and the blind community of the state. It is fair to say

that by the time the Commission board finally recognized the problem and got around to firing Mr. Taylor the Commission program was a shambles. What had been a smooth and harmonious operation (a source of pride to the general public of Iowa and the blind of the nation) was a disorganized hotbed of fear, tension,

factionalism, hatred, suspicion, bitterness, and pessimism—an object of general embarrassment and a textbook example of what a service program should not be.

With the firing of Mr. Taylor, the blind of the state and the nation hoped that there might come a period of healing and rebuilding—an attempt to salvage something of the Commission's former reputation and positive values. After all, the building (one of the finest in the country) was still there; the law and the administrative structure (although damaged by erosion) were still basically intact; the largest library for the blind in the world, with its unmatched collection of books and excellent facilities (though weakened by lack of direction and loss of philosophy) was still viable; and many of the staff who had made up the superb team of the pre-1978 Commission (though divided and demoralized by lack of leadership) were still present. Even so, the task facing the new director would be formidable. It would mean reversing trends which were now well-established and becoming the norm. It was clear that the Commission would have only a little time (if, indeed, it was not already too late) to halt the plunge to total ruin and destruction.

The board of the Commission was composed of three members. Arlene Dayhoff was a political appointee of the Governor with no experience at all concerning blindness. Nolden Gentry, the chairman, had the qualifications of being a former basketball player and an undistinguished Des Moines lawyer. As with Mrs. Dayhoff, he had absolutely no background to give him knowledge about blindness or the Commission's programs. The third member of the board (and the only one who was blind) was Richard Crawford of Sioux City. He had personal knowledge of the Commission's programs, was successfully competing in business as an investment

counselor, and had demonstrated through his own life that he knew what blindness was about. This was the board, which, in the spring of 1982, was faced with the difficult task of selecting a new director for the ailing Commission for the Blind.

Chairman Gentry began with an action which did not bode well for the future. He made the kind of error which has become standard operating procedure for the Iowa Commission for the Blind in recent years. He hired Nancy Norman, the wife of his law partner, as acting interim director. She was sighted, had absolutely no experience or background in dealing with the blind or programs for the blind, and could only claim distinction as an employee of the State Department of Social Services in the fiscal and budgetary area. Mr. Gentry sought to forestall criticism by saying that Ms. Norman would only be serving for a short time and would, under no circumstances, be a candidate for the permanent position. The board then hired a so-called "search firm" at something over \$12,000 and announced that it would seek the best qualified applicant in the country. Of course, the search firm (like most of the other actors in the drama) knew nothing about blindness either, but—well, at this stage what difference did it make?

The procedure for hiring a director was like a vaudeville routine. The search firm went through the motion of calling various state directors and other knowledgeable people throughout the country (including President Jernigan) and received 147 (or was it 146?) applications. The employment process was to be a living demonstration of participatory democracy. The search firm would screen the applicants down to nine or ten and the Commission board would then eliminate all but the top four or five. Actually, they ended up with three: Bob Pogorelec, the former Director of the Oregon Commission for the Blind; Jim

Omvig, a former Assistant Director at the Iowa Commission and now an administrator at the Social Security Administration; and—what do you know?—Nancy Norman.

But all would be well. It would be very democratic. Each of the three finalists would be interviewed by not just one but two panels made up of Commission staff members and blind consumers. They would be interviewed by the search firm, the Governor, various other assorted individuals and groups and—oh, yes—the Commission board. And when it was all over (after two days of interviewing and considering and agonizing) who emerged as the most qualified candidate in the nation—the person who had met every test and survived every rigorous challenge? None other than Nancy Norman.

The resulting explosion of resentment and disappointment could have been anticipated—by anybody, that is, except the people who now run things at the Iowa Commission for the Blind. Significantly, Richard Crawford (the only blind member of the board) voted against the Norman appointment and strenuously fought to prevent it. The Governor tried to create diversion by saying that somebody or another objected to Norman because she was a woman—not to mention which he said, you don't need a blind person to run programs for the blind anyway. A number of legislators and many of the blind of the state called for Gentry's resignation—and Ms. Norman contented herself with the comment that—yes, it was true that she didn't know anything about blindness but that she really didn't need to. Her staff members would handle that sort of thing, and they would report to her. She wouldn't be working directly with the blind anyway.

The newspapers and the television had a field day. The fighting and the dissension were greater than ever, and services for the blind of the state seem to have been dealt

the final death blow. If it were not so tragic, it would be the greatest piece of slapstick since Sunday night television.

But, of course, the blind of the state of Iowa (including children who are not yet born) need the rehabilitation, library, and other services which only the Commission is in a position to provide. We cannot and will not simply write the whole thing off as a bad joke and let it go at that. A new Governor is taking office (one who gives promise of having more courage and understanding than his predecessor), and Commission board members do not hold office forever. The National Federation of the Blind of Iowa and the friends of the blind throughout the state will not give up. They will continue to insist that the programs of the Commission be rebuilt and that sanity again reassert itself. The best predictions are that Ms. Norman will be gone in less than a year.

Federation leaders issued press releases October 18, 1982, and October 25, 1982:

**NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF THE BLIND OF IOWA**
An Affiliate of the
National Federation of the Blind

For Immediate Release October 18, 1982

*Contact: Ms. Jan Ray, President
Des Moines Chapter NFBI
515-274-1341*

BLIND LEADERS CHARGE BOARD

CHAIRMAN WITH "LIES,"

"SMOKESCREEN"

The vice-president of the National Federation of the Blind of Iowa today charged

that the hiring of Fleming Associates to conduct a nationwide job search for the successor to ousted Commission for the Blind director, John Taylor, was "only a smokescreen to make (Board Chairman) Nolden Gentry's hiring of his law partner's wife seem legitimate."

Bob Ray, speaking for the organization, said that "the expenditure of over \$12,000 in badly-needed Commission funds for an elaborate coverup of Gentry's cronyism, shows that he's more interested in promoting his well-to-do friends than he is in providing a good Commission Director for the blind of Iowa."

"Looking back," said Ray, "we can see how deceptive Gentry was. He hired an executive search firm which had worked closely with him before, even though they did not submit the lowest bid. He moved Nancy Norman, the wife of his law partner (Keith Uhl) into the agency as interim director. Finally, he succeeded in delaying the search for a new director long enough so she could gain some experience, and he could claim she was qualified for the job."

"Her appointment as interim director was just a glorified on-the-job training," Ray added.

"Gentry lied to us," continued D. Curtis Willoughby, Federation board member. "He said she wasn't going to apply for the permanent job, and we believed him. We tolerated her lack of ability only because we believed she wasn't going to be permanent. We thought things were being given a cooling-off period, so we could work together with the board in harmony, choosing a new director."

Willoughby added, "When we found out Gentry had lied to us, and Mrs. Norman-Uhl had applied for the job, we set about to alert the legislature and general public by distributing a Fact Sheet showing her lack of qualifications. But Gentry ignored our opinions, and hired her over

two highly qualified candidates."

Willoughby pointed out that Gentry, as chairman of the Governor's Ad Hoc Committee on the Iowa Commission for the Blind in 1978, said that the Commission Board members and Director should avoid "even the appearance of conflict of interest."

"So much for Mr. Gentry's high principles," Willoughby said. "His standards of behavior seem to apply to everybody but himself."

Willoughby said the Federation is "considering asking for an investigation into Gentry's conflict of interest and general insensitivity to the needs of blind consumers. He's just a rich guy who feels he has all the answers and doesn't need to listen to the citizens of Iowa. We've had enough."

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND OF IOWA

An Affiliate of the
National Federation of the Blind

For Immediate Release October 25, 1982

Contact: Jan Ray
274-1341

BLIND CALL FOR GENTRY'S

RESIGNATION

The National Federation of the Blind of Iowa went on record as having no confidence in Nolden Gentry, Chairman of the Iowa Commission for the Blind board and unanimously called for his resignation. The action was taken at the group's state board meeting held in Des Moines this weekend.

NFBI President, Peggy Pinder, described Gentry's role in selecting the new Commission director as the latest example of his incompetence and disregard for the true needs of Iowa's blind.

Nancy Norman was so obviously assured of having the job already, that during the interview process she was rude and abusive to Pinder who was part of the interview team.

"Such behavior in any other applicant would have been inexcusable and grounds for disqualification," Pinder stated. Others expressed outrage that Gentry endorsed Norman, the wife of a law partner, and continues to defend her. Several pointed out that Gentry was well aware that she had no background and only four months' experience working with the blind.

The NFBI voted not to accept her appointment and particularly noted the waste of over \$12,000 in tax money paid to select her.

A letter written to Gentry by Jim Omvig, one of the three finalists for the director's position, was read at the meeting. Omvig accuses Gentry of governing the Agency as if it were providing first-class jobs for staff and only incidentally providing services for the blind.

Omvig further states that a nine-year-old can read the resumes of the finalists and draw a more accurate conclusion than Gentry did to who is more qualified.

Omvig revealed that the salary of the Iowa directorship is less than that of his current tenured position.

The NFB is an organization of consumers formed to help insure that all blind persons can receive quality service from various agencies and to lead independent lives in general.

Mrs. Nell Bonnell, former Commission board member and a past president of the Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs, was

quoted extensively in an article appearing in the October 19, 1982, *Fort Dodge Messenger*:

BLIND PERSON SHOULD HEAD

COMMISSION, BONNELL SAYS

"I really think a blind person should be the director of the Iowa Commission for the Blind," Nell Bonnell of Fort Dodge said Monday in criticizing the appointment of Nancy Norman, 37, Des Moines, to that position.

Mrs. Bonnell, 77, 815 Forest Ave., served on the commission from 1969 to 1978. When Gov. Robert Ray appointed Arlene Dayhoff of Cedar Rapids to succeed her in July 1978, there was a storm of protest from Iowans who are members of the National Federation of the Blind.

Mrs. Norman was a top administrator in the Iowa Department of Social Services before being loaned to the commission in June as interim director. She succeeded John Taylor, who was forced to resign in March after four years as director.

There is controversy over Norman's permanent appointment for these reasons: she is sighted and National Federation of the Blind of Iowa members have campaigned for appointment of a blind person; she is the wife of Keith Uhl, a law partner of Nolden Gentry, Des Moines, chairman of the three-member commission; she never worked with blind before June; the only blind member of the commission, Robert Crawford, Sioux City, voted against her appointment.

Mrs. Bonnell called the appointment "an insult to the blind of the state." She said the \$12,000 paid in consultant fees in the search for a director is money wasted and that the commission should have handled that job without such outside help.

"Mrs. Norman has said she will not work directly with the blind, that she will leave that to her staff," Mrs. Bonnell noted. "That just blows my mind—how can anyone direct the program as it should be directed that way?"

The Fort Dodger is critical of Gentry, commission chairman, who denies there is any conflict of interest in appointing Norman even though she is the wife of his law partner. "I remember so well that when we were embroiled in the controversy over Kenneth Jernigan (former commission director) Mr. Gentry's warning that even the appearance of conflict must be avoided." Mrs. Bonnell said, "It's strange now that he doesn't see the obvious conflict."

What she fears, Mrs. Bonnell says, is that the excellent program for the blind built up during the Jernigan directorship is deteriorating. "Iowa's program was considered the best in the nation at that time," she said. "Many blind persons were employed on the staff. Now there are few. The Norman appointment is just one more step toward putting the program for the blind under the Department of Social Welfare, and it doesn't belong there. The blind want to be independent and they can be, with proper training."

Mrs. Bonnell said her phone has been "ringing off the hook" with calls from irate persons since the Friday appointment. "Surely there were qualified blind applicants who could have been appointed," Mrs. Bonnell said. One she believes would have been a good choice is James Omvig of Baltimore, Md., a graduate of the rehabilitation program in Des Moines who is now with the Social Security Administration in a job dealing with handicapped.

Norman will receive \$37,500 a year and oversee 103 employees and a \$3.1 million budget. The commission annually serves 6,000 to 7,000 blind Iowans.

Members of the commission are Gentry, Crawford and Arlene Dayhoff of Cedar Rapids.

Jo Ann Slayton of Coralville, president of the Iowa Association of the Blind, praised Norman's selection, but Peggy Pinder of Sioux City, president of the National Federation of the Blind of Iowa, was highly critical.

Gentry said he agrees with Crawford that a blind person should head the agency "everything else being equal, but we did not find everything else equal." He refused to identify the other two finalists for the position because they requested that their applications be confidential.

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF DETERIORATING SERVICES

AT THE IOWA COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND

by James Gashel

The attached letter from Rose Sandahl is direct evidence of how the Iowa Commission's services have deteriorated to the disadvantage of blind Iowans. Mrs. Sandahl

sought advice from a Commission staff member concerning the effect which her work would have on her Social Security Disability Insurance benefits. At best, Mrs.

Sandahl was confused, not helped, by the "advice" she received. At worst, (depending on what was actually said to her) she was badly misinformed. This could have caused Mrs. Sandahl to incur a substantial overpayment and a debt of major proportions to Social Security. Fortunately for Mrs. Sandahl, she had sense enough to question what she was being told.

On a question such as the one posed by Mrs. Sandahl, the professional rehabilitation staff at the Iowa Commission for the Blind should be knowledgeable enough to give correct, complete, up-to-date, and clear information. In fact, the Commission once had a respected reputation for providing blind persons and other agencies with meaningful and timely information. Even local representatives of the Social Security Administration would rely upon representations made by Commission staff. However, such can no longer be the case if misinformation is being conveyed concerning such elementary matters as those in the questions raised by Mrs. Sandahl.

Boone, Iowa
October 12, 1982

Dear Mr. Gashel:

I am legally blind and am an unemployed teacher. I am looking for employment either in teaching in the Boone area or part-time work in some other field. Since I have been unemployed as a teacher I baby-sat in my home for some time. I baby-sat full-time and have been told by Alice Heleen of the Social Security office in Ames, Iowa that my trial period is gone. I discussed this with Marsha Sharp of the Iowa Commission for the Blind in Des Moines and she said that a law had been passed and they couldn't take away your trial period. Could you give me more

information on this matter.

Also, in looking for part-time work around Boone, I have been told that the most they pay is \$3.35 per hour which is minimum wage. I was under the assumption that the minimum wage was \$3.65 per hour. Will you please enlighten me on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Rose Sandahl

Baltimore, Maryland
October 27, 1982

Dear Mrs. Sandahl:

This will reply to and thank you for your letter of October 12.

The baby-sitting work you have done has probably been counted as "trial work" for purposes of determining your continued eligibility for Social Security Disability Insurance. In seeing this, I am assuming, of course, that the amount of work and your earnings from it have been reported to Social Security. The basic trial work period is nine months. Any work is counted as long as you earn at least \$75 in a month. The months of work need not be consecutive to be counted as months of the trial work period. Enough work to earn \$75 in a single month is the only factor. As a result, intermittent part-time jobs normally may cause exhaustion of the trial work period.

Marsha Sharp incorrectly advised you, if she led you to believe you could not exhaust your trial work period by means of the baby-sitting. She is correct in saying that the law concerning trial work has been changed. However, the change does not affect the issue under discussion. The fact is, that the law has not been changed with respect to the basic nine-month trial work period. The change applies to work which

occurs following the expiration of nine months of trial work.

Under the new law, which took effect in 1980, it is easier than it used to be for a working person to regain entitlement to monthly cash benefits if employment ceases. This is so because a beneficiary who is terminated because of work will be reinstated to the rolls if the work ends (or earnings are reduced enough) during a fifteen-month period following the first nine-months of trial work. No checks are payable to a working beneficiary other than the checks for the first twelve months of employment. This has been the rule for a long time. The 1980 change only makes it easier to qualify again as work stops or is reduced.

During 1982, a blind SSDI beneficiary will normally be permitted to have earnings of up to \$500 per month. Five-hundred dollars in monthly earnings is the amount considered to represent "substantial gainful activity" for a blind SSDI beneficiary. Blind persons who normally earn less than this amount will continue to receive SSDI checks beyond the nine-month trial work period. This is true because such individuals are not considered to be performing substantial gainful activity. Thus, average monthly earnings of \$300 or \$400 per month may continue indefinitely without having any effect upon your eligibility for SSDI checks. The only effect such earnings have is to exhaust the trial work period, as I described earlier.

The amount you can earn per month in 1983 will be announced shortly by Social

Security. The amount permitted for the blind is the same amount which persons retiring at age 65 may earn without reducing their retirement checks. Presumably, this will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$530 to \$550 per month during 1983. [Since the writing of Mr. Gashel's letter, the amount has been announced. It is \$550 per month for 1983.]

In many respects, the rules for eligibility which apply to the blind are more favorable than those for persons with other disabling conditions. This is so because we have been well organized to inform Congress and the Social Security Administration of our needs. Of course, it is important for any blind person such as you, to know the law in order for you to receive the benefits to which you are entitled. Staff members of the Iowa Commission for the Blind should be prepared to convey correct, complete, and clear information in order to avoid confusion on the part of individuals such as you. Their failure to do this can result in serious errors for which blind persons, such as you, may ultimately pay the price. This is why we as blind people must organize together. It is also why I have given you such a detailed but hopefully clear explanation of your rights.

Cordially yours,
James Gashel
Director of Governmental Affairs

P.S. Incidentally, the federal minimum wage is \$3.35 per hour, not \$3.65 per hour.

DATA ON THE COST OF RECORDED MATERIAL
PRODUCED BY NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE
FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Recently the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped released statistics concerning its costs for recorded material for fiscal 1980, 1981, and 1982. These statistics do not include costs for recorded magazines, nor do they include costs for cassettes recorded by NLS as opposed to purchases from outside

suppliers. NLS records some of its own cassettes but purchases all flexible discs and hard discs from outside suppliers. We printed statistics on the cost of the production of Braille books in an earlier issue of the *Monitor*. Salaries, supplies, administration, and other costs are not reflected in these statistics:

RECORDED CASSETTE BOOK TITLES
(Includes contracted record and duplicate titles only)
Cost Analysis—Three Year Comparison

	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	Cumulative Increase
<hr/>				
A. Analysis of the Cost Per Recorded Cassette Copy				
Average Number of Recorded Cassettes	2.2	2.4	2.6	+ 18%
Average Unit Price Per Cassette	\$2.25	\$1.95	\$2.29	+ 2%
Average Cost Per Copy	\$4.94	\$4.68	\$5.95	+ 20%
B. Analysis of the Cost Per Recorded Cassette Title				
Average Cost Per Copy	\$4.94	\$4.68	\$5.95	+ 20%

Average Number of Copies Per Title	751	706	757	+ 1%
Average Cost Per Title	\$3,710	\$3,304	\$4,504	+ 21%

C. Analysis of Cumulative Recorded Cassette Expenditures

Annual Title Goal	650	650	650	NA
Actual Titles Produced	865	630	556	+ 5% over goal (over three years)
Average Cost Per Title	\$3,710	\$3,304	\$4,504	+ 21%
Total Expenditures	\$3,209,150	\$2,081,520	\$2,504,224	- 22%

FLEXIBLE DISC BOOK TITLES

Cost Analysis—Three Year Comparison

	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	Cumulative Increase
--	-------	-------	-------	------------------------

A. Analysis of the Cost Per Flexible Disc Copy

Average Number of Flexible Discs	7.1	7.8	7.3	+ 3%
Average Unit Price Per Disc	.470	.505	.543	+ 15%
Average Cost Per Copy	\$3.34	\$3.94	\$3.96	+ 19%

B. Analysis of the Cost Per Flexible Disc Title

Average Cost Per Copy	\$3.34	\$3.94	\$3.96	+ 19%
Average Number of Copies Per Title	3,027	2,975	2,888	- 5%
Average Cost Per Title	\$10,110	\$11,721	\$11,436	+ 13%

C. Analysis of Cumulative Flexible Disc Expenditures

Annual Title Goal	100	100	100	NA
Actual Titles Produced	98	90	90	7% below goal (over three years)
Average Cost Per Title	\$10,110	\$11,721	\$11,436	+ 13%
Total Expenditures	\$990,780	\$1,054,890	\$1,029,240	+ 4%

RIGID DISC BOOK TITLES

Cost Analysis—Three Year Comparison

	FY'80	FY'81	FY'82	Cumulative Increase
<hr/>				
A. Analysis of the Cost Per Rigid Disc Copy				
Average Number of Rigid Discs	3.52	3.73	3.75	+ 7%
Average Unit Price Per Disc	\$1.57	\$1.79	\$1.95	+ 24%

Average Cost Per Copy	\$5.53	\$6.68	\$7.31	+ 32%
-----------------------	--------	--------	--------	-------

B. Analysis of the Cost Per Rigid Disc Title

Average Cost Per Copy	\$5.53	\$6.68	\$7.31	+ 32%
-----------------------	--------	--------	--------	-------

Average Number of Copies Per Title	902	805	808	- 10%
------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-------

Average Cost Per Title	\$4,988.06	\$5,377.40	\$5,906.48	+ 18%
------------------------	------------	------------	------------	-------

C. Analysis of Cumulative Rigid Disc Expenditures

Annual Title Goal	350	350	350	NA
-------------------	-----	-----	-----	----

Actual Titles Produced	350	318	300	8% below goal (over three years)
------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-------------------------------------

Average Cost Per Title	\$4,988.06	\$5,377.40	\$5,906.48	+ 18%
------------------------	------------	------------	------------	-------

Total Expenditures	\$1,745,821	\$1,710,013	\$1,771,944	+ 2%
--------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: AN ILLINOIS RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION 82-03

Whereas, Governor Thompson has appointed Sue Suter as Executive Associate Director of the Illinois Department of Rehabilitation (IDORS); and

Whereas, despite the fact that this appointment was made in March, it has yet to be presented to the Senate for confirma-

tion; and

Whereas, Mrs. Suter's husband, Carl, is currently employed as the Associate Executive Director of the Illinois Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, a trade association of private agencies whose members collectively do millions of dollars of business

with IDORS each year; and

Whereas, this situation raises questions of conflict of interest and ethical impropriety; and

Whereas, despite these serious questions of conflict of interest and the fact that her nomination has never been submitted to the Senate, Mrs. Suter has been serving as Executive Associate Director of IDORS for over six months: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the National Federation of the Blind of Illinois in Convention assembled this 11th day of September,

1982 in the city of Bradley, Illinois, that this Federation calls upon Governor Thompson to immediately remove Mrs. Suter from any position of leadership within the IDORS Department of Rehabilitation Services; and

Be it further resolved that we call upon the Senate Executive Appointments Committee to demand its right to review gubernatorial appointments and launch a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the Suter nomination.

COMMENTS FROM RAY KURZWEIL

Federationists will remember that the May, 1982, *Monitor* was largely devoted to an examination of the present and future status of Braille. Shortly after the May issue appeared, Ray Kurzweil wrote President Jernigan concerning the future of the Kurzweil Reading Machine:

Cambridge, Massachusetts
May 6, 1982

Dear Dr. Jernigan:

In the May 1982 issue of the *Braille Monitor*, you expressed concern about whether sufficient development support would be given to the Kurzweil Reading Machine to enable it to remain an ongoing major factor in the total mix of reading for the blind as well as fulfilling the initial hopes that people had for it. By initial hopes, I assume you mean a powerful print-to-speech machine that is easily and widely available to most blind persons. I want to reassure you that enormous support is being devoted to ongoing development of the reading machine, and that the advent of

a widely available device will ultimately be achieved.

Since our acquisition by Xerox over two years ago, our overall research and development program has been greatly expanded, which has benefited both of our products—the Kurzweil Reading Machine (KRM) and our commercial data entry machine. Beyond this, we are in the process of making a strategic change which will be of enormous benefit to the reading machine. Because of the exacting demand of the commercial data entry market, (character recognition accuracy rates must be extremely high, and the system must be able to handle a very wide range of materials, including highly degraded poor quality print), the character recognition technology in our data entry machine has become substantially more powerful and more sophisticated than that in the reading machine. We have been unable to utilize this more powerful character recognition system in the reading machine because the data entry machine has required an operator to resolve ambiguous identifications

that the machine was unable to resolve itself. A recent development has now largely eliminated the need for this operator for the data entry machine thus enabling the more powerful data entry machine character recognition system to resolve these ambiguous identifications without human assistance. We are, therefore, now in the process of adapting this new operatorless data entry character recognition system for the KRM. We are also aligning other aspects of our technology to be relatively identical between the two products.

This has two profound implications. First, it will mean an immediate substantial boost in the power of the character recognition system in the reading machine—which is obviously the heart of the reading machine's technology. Second, and I think even more important, it means that all of our improvements to character recognition in the future will benefit the reading machine directly. There will no longer be two separate efforts, with reading machine users benefiting only from the separate reading machine development effort. By aligning the two technologies in this and other ways, all of our development efforts will assist the performance of the reading machine. Because this development effort is funded in large part by revenues from our commercial data entry product, this effort is quite substantial—over 30 persons are now involved full-time, almost all of which will be of direct benefit to the KRM.

We are also taking important steps to improve other aspects of the KRM—speech quality, human factors, user controls, and so on. As before, we continue to be guided by the input and suggestions of our several thousand users across the country.

The KRM in the six years since its introduction has already benefited from several generations of technology improvement. Many early problems, in the areas of character recognition, reliability, pronun-

ciation and human interface have been solved. The ability of the machine to read a wide variety of printed materials and the sophistication of its technology in general has progressed very substantially during this period of time. The NFB has, as you know, played a very important role in helping to guide these developments. Due to the factors described above, there will be further important progress in the near term and a large scale ongoing development effort to provide greater performance in the future.

With regard to availability, I agree that the machine is presently too expensive for most individuals and is primarily intended for institutional use (e.g., libraries, schools, etc.) where it can be shared by multiple users. There are now close to 300 machines being used by several thousand users, and we expect to double this number by the end of next year. We are also taking steps to address this issue. The machine will eventually be less expensive, although this will not occur in the near-term. Over the long-term, the machine will benefit from the same trends that are benefiting other computer-based technologies such as calculators and home computers. These goals cannot be achieved overnight, but we are deeply committed to ultimately achieving the hopes that you alluded to in your article. If we take a projection of, let us say, sometime in the 1990's, I foresee Kurzweil Reading Machines of enormous reading power and sophistication being owned by virtually every blind person who has any interest in reading. At this time the machine will benefit other populations as well, such as dyslexic individuals (who are unable to read for reasons other than visual impairment) and children who are learning to read for the first time using the device as a pedagogical tool.

In the meantime, we are taking steps to make machines available to those who can

benefit from them. For example, in a joint program with our parent company Xerox Corporation, we are donating 100 Kurzweil Reading Machines to colleges and universities across the country. We are also donating a machine, as you know, to the NFB for use in its national headquarters.

I hope these comments have been helpful.

Sincerely,
Raymond C. Kurzweil, President
Kurzweil Computer Products

SCHOLARSHIPS OFFERED BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

The National Federation of the Blind strives, in every way that it can, to promote its goals of security, equality, and opportunity for the blind. This includes the awarding of an increasing number of scholarships to blind students. Although (to some extent) all of the states provide aid to college students through their rehabilitation agencies, some do better than others. This year, at its National Convention in Kansas City in July, the National Federation of the Blind is offering four scholarships: The Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, \$1,200; two Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarships, each for \$2,500; and the Melva T. Owen Memorial Scholarship, \$1,200.

In her will Dr. Isabelle Grant left \$35,000 to the NFB as a perpetual scholarship fund. The will states: "The interest from said sum shall be used for annual scholarships for blind female students for education at the college level, said fund to be known as the Hermione Grant Calhoun Scholarship." Interest rates being what they have been, two very excellent scholarships can be offered at this summer's convention. As has been said, each will be in the amount of \$2,500. To be eligible an individual must be female and must be

attending (or planning to attend) a college or university.

The Howard Brown Rickard Scholarship, awarded by the National Federation of the Blind, is an annual grant of \$1,200 presented at the NFB National Convention. Only students in certain fields of study are eligible because the donor of the scholarship wanted to encourage the blind to enter those fields. The scholarship was established by a bequest of Thomas E. Rickard in honor of his father, Howard Brown Rickard. Any legally blind university student in the professions of law, medicine, engineering, architecture, or the natural sciences, including undergraduates in these fields, is eligible to apply.

Our newest addition is the Melva T. Owen Memorial Scholarship, which was instituted last year. In a letter dated November 30, 1981, Mr. Charles Owen discussed the new scholarship:

Dear Dr. Jernigan:

This refers to my previous correspondence with Reverend Howard May concerning our wish to establish a continuing scholarship award to be administered by the NFB.

It is our wish to offer a scholarship to

a worthy blind student each year, beginning in 1982. All publicity will be handled by NFB, and all applications will be sent to NFB. NFB will appoint a scholarship selection committee to determine the successful applicant. The Tarver Fund will not be involved in any of this.

In selecting the student to receive the award, our guidelines in general would be no different from those of the Rickard scholarships as indicated in the application blank for same furnished us by Mr. May: Either undergraduates or graduates [the 1983 scholarship will be limited to undergraduates] as long as they are working toward a professional or technical goal; the provision of evidence of satisfactory work to date in that direction; the submission of the short essay; the approval of the local NFB chapter; and the like. We would make no sex distinctions, and no limitations as to field of study except that it should not be religious (this is inherent in pursuit of a professional or technical goal, it seems to me) since we do not want to be drawn into discussions of doctrinal differences amongst various religious students.

We do not wish to be involved in the selection process and we want to leave this entirely in your much more capable hands, but we do wish to receive copies of the essay and other material submitted by the one you select to receive the award.

We wish as much publicity given the

award as possible, but its scope and extent will be up to you. The award is being made in memory and honor of my deceased wife and so should be called the MELVA T. OWEN MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP, and the more people who know about it the greater the memory and honor, especially among the hundreds of blind people who knew and loved her while she was here with us.

To obtain an application form for any of these scholarships, write to Reverend Howard E. May, RFD 2—Clint Eldredge Road, West Willington, Connecticut 06279. The deadline for application is May 1st.

To be eligible for any of these scholarships, an individual must: (a) be recommended by the state affiliate of the National Federation of the Blind where he or she lives, goes to school, or is planning to go to school; and (b) attend the NFB Convention at which the scholarship is to be awarded.

Membership in the Federation is *not* a prerequisite for eligibility for any of the scholarships, but as has already been noted, applicants must be recommended by an NFB state affiliate.

Application forms are available from Reverend Howard May, at the address already given. The application must be filled out completely and returned to Reverend May by May 1, 1983. It should be emphasized that candidates who have previously applied and have not been awarded a scholarship are eligible to apply again. In fact, they are urged to do so.

POSSIBLE NEW SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR AGENCIES SERVING THE BLIND

by James Gashel

Recently, Mrs. Ramona Walhof, the new Director of the Idaho Commission for the Blind, asked me for ideas concerning sources of revenue for a state agency, in addition to those normally utilized. Attached is a copy of the letter which I sent her explaining the possibilities under the new "Job Training Partnership Act," Public Law 97-300. I believe that statewide job training programs for the blind are a natural for funding under Section 121 of this act. Funds under this section are distributed by the governor of each state to programs which he determines have merit in addressing special unemployment problems.

The new job training bill also has various other provisions which state agencies should consider using. If the agencies follow their normal practice, however, most of them will fail to look beyond the traditional sources of funding available under the Rehabilitation Act. Then, these agencies will continue to cry "poverty." Our (JOB) program should be a good lesson in how to obtain needed assistance for blind persons under laws other than the Rehabilitation Act.

Baltimore, Maryland
November 9, 1982

Dear Mrs. Walhof:

This will respond to your request for information concerning the new job training bill enacted by Congress on October 1

and signed into law by President Reagan. This act, known as the "Job Training Partnership Act," replaces the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), which expired at midnight on September 30, 1982. The Job Training Partnership Act is now properly referenced as Public Law 97-300.

I mentioned the possibility that the Idaho Commission for the Blind could finance, in whole or in part, employment-related programs under this statute. I think this is a very real possibility, given the language contained in Section 121 of the Act. A copy of this section is enclosed. Particularly, I call your attention to subsection (c), which, in its ten numbered paragraphs, contains a variety of references to programs which the Idaho Commission for the Blind is capable of carrying out for the benefit of unemployed blind persons in Idaho. Paragraphs (3) and (10) are especially noteworthy. Section 202(b)(4) provides that the governor shall have 5% of the funds allotted to the state under this act for carrying out activities and programs authorized in Section 121.

Most persons served by the Idaho Commission for the Blind would, by virtue of being blind, be eligible for participation in a program funded under the Job Training Partnership Act. Section 203(a)(1) establishes that persons who are "economically disadvantaged" are primarily eligible for job training services under this act. The term "economically disadvantaged" would

include blind SSI recipients, as well as most SSDI beneficiaries. In addition, Section 203(a)(2) provides that up to 10% of the participants in a program need not be "economically disadvantaged," so long as they encounter "barriers to employment." This section specifically indicates "handicapped individuals" as being among those who suffer these "barriers."

To begin the process of establishing a training program funded through the governor's office under Public Law 97-300, you should start now to contact the appropriate staff responsible for developing these programs and state plans. Good luck. I would be pleased to know the results.

Cordially yours,

James Gashel

Director of Governmental Affairs

P.S. Although I have ordered copies of Public Law 97-300, I do not have one that I can send you at this point. When my extra copies arrive, you can be sure I will forward one immediately. No doubt you can find other provisions of this act which may be utilized by the Commission.

EXCERPTS FROM PUBLIC LAW 97-300

Part B—Additional State Responsibilities

Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan

Sec. 121. (a)(1) The Governor shall annually prepare a statement of goals and objectives for job training and placement programs within the State to assist in the preparation of the plans required under section 104 of this Act and section 7(a) of the Act of June 6, 1933 (known as the Wagner-Peyser Act).

(2) Any State seeking financial assistance under this Act shall submit a Governor's coordination and special services plan for two program years to the Secretary describing the use of all resources provided to the State and its service delivery areas under this Act and evaluating the experience over the preceding two years.

(b)(1) The plan shall establish criteria for coordinating activities under this Act (including title III) with programs and services provided by State and local education and training agencies (including vocational education agencies), public assistance agencies, the employment service, rehabilitation agencies, postsecondary institutions, economic development agencies, and such other agencies as the Governor determines to have a direct interest in employment and training and human resource utilization within the State. Such criteria shall not affect local discretion concerning the selection of eligible participants or service providers in accordance with the provisions of sections 107 and 203.

(2) The plan shall describe the projected use of resources, including oversight and support activities, priorities and criteria for State incentive grants, and performance goals for State supported programs.

(3) The Governor shall report to the Secretary the adjustments made in the performance standards and the factors that are used in making the adjustments.

(4) If major changes occur in labor market conditions, funding, or other factors during the two-year period covered by the plan, the State shall submit a modification to the Secretary describing these changes.

(c) Governor's coordination and special services activities may include—

(1) making available to service delivery areas, with or without reimbursement and upon request, appropriate information and technical assistance to

assist in developing and implementing plans and programs;

(2) carrying out special model training and employment programs and related services (including programs receiving financial assistance from private sources);

(3) providing programs and related services for offenders and other individuals whom the Governor determines require special assistance;

(4) providing financial assistance for special programs and services designed to meet the needs of rural areas outside major labor market areas;

(5) providing training opportunities in the conservation and efficient use of energy, and the development of solar energy sources as defined in section 3 of the Solar Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974;

(6) industry-wide training;

(7) activities under title III of this

Act;

(8) developing and providing to service delivery areas information on a State and local area basis regarding economic, industrial, and labor market conditions;

(9) providing preservice and inservice training for planning, management, and delivery staffs of administrative entities and private industry councils, as well as contractors for State supported programs; and

(10) providing statewide programs which provide for joint funding of activities under this Act with services and activities under other Federal, State, or local employment-related programs.

(d) A Governor's coordination and special services plan shall be approved by the Secretary unless the Secretary determines that the plan does not comply with specific provisions of this Act.

A PRESS RELEASE FROM MINNESOTA

(Note: As Federationists know, the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC) held its fall meeting in Jackson, Mississippi, during the first weekend of November, 1982. Blind people from throughout the country went to Jackson to make a visible demonstration to the public that NAC is not supported by the blind and that it opposes quality services for blind people. The blind of Minnesota sent a large delegation. Before they left for Jackson, the Minnesotans issued the following press release):

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 4, 1982

Several hundred members of the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) including 14 blind Minnesotans will be in Jackson, Mississippi this weekend to protest the

unethical practices of a self-styled New York-based "accrediting" body.

The occasion is the annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the National

Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC). NFB members from more than 25 states are expected to picket the meeting on Saturday and Sunday, November 6 and 7, and engage in other public informational activities.

"Calling NAC an accrediting agency is like calling Al Capone a law-abiding citizen," asserted NFB State President Joyce Scanlan who will lead the Minnesota contingent in Jackson. NAC's so-called "accreditation" of agencies serving the blind is based on politics not performance. NAC's so-called "standards" are irrelevant at best and harmful at worst. NAC accredits sheltered workshops that pay less than the minimum wage. NAC orchestrates political opposition against public and private agencies which refuse NAC "accreditation." NAC defends agencies that break the law. A legitimate accrediting agency would abhor behavior of this kind.

In 1979, NAC intervened on behalf of the Minneapolis Society for the Blind (MSB), the only NAC accredited agency in Minnesota, after the Minnesota Supreme Court found the Society in violation of the State Nonprofit Corporations Act and ordered a new election for MSB's Board of Directors. NAC actively worked with MSB management to resist efforts by blind Minnesotans to elect their own representatives to the Society's Board. In 1972, the Society, without soliciting public bids, awarded a \$200,000 plumbing and heating contract to its own president, Richard Johnstone. In 1974, the U.S. Department of Labor found wage and hour violations in the Society's sheltered workshop. Despite these violations of law and ethics, NAC "accreditation" of the Society continues unabated.

Elsewhere NAC refused to withdraw its "accreditation" even after grand juries issued criminal indictments against the

head of a NAC-accredited state agency for the blind in Alabama. A state auditor uncovered widespread corruption and mismanagement in New York's ten state-supported sheltered workshops for the blind, seven of which were and still are NAC-accredited. NAC has organized political pressure against public and private agencies for the blind who have refused to associate themselves with NAC including those in California, Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, Maryland and other states.

Despite nearly two decades in the field, NAC has persuaded fewer than one-fifth of the nation's 500 or so agencies for the blind to seek or accept NAC "accreditation." Today NAC's base of financial support is equally narrow with more than half of the agency's annual budget coming from one single New York-based private agency—the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB). Over a period of several years, more than 600,000 federal dollars flowed into NAC from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) until 1974 when dissatisfaction with the agency's performance caused HEW to cut off all aid. Congress and the Executive Branch have repeatedly denied NAC demands that federal aid to programs for the blind be funneled exclusively to NAC-accredited agencies.

"Beginning in the mid 1960's we tried to work with NAC in an effort to shape it into a constructive force," explained Mrs. Scanlan. "After a few years, however, it became clear that NAC had no interest in promoting quality. That's when we began expressing our concerns to Congress, the media and the public. NFB members have picketed every annual NAC board meeting since 1972. A good accrediting body should be both independent and objective. NAC's vindictive behavior and narrow base of moral and financial support prevent it from achieving this goal."

Since 1940, the National Federation of the Blind has promoted greater security, equality and opportunity for all blind

persons through public education, legislation and action in the courts.

BLIND PICKET WORKSHOP IN NASHVILLE

For many years the state of Tennessee has operated sheltered workshops in Nashville and Memphis. Recently the state decided to turn over operation of the workshops to the Lions Clubs. Many of the blind were afraid that this would simply mean that a bad situation would now become worse. It would seem that their fears were coming true. The following story by Associated Press capsulizes what is happening:

Nashville
September 16, 1982

30 Sight-Impaired Workers Protest Workshop Changes

About 30 sight-impaired workers, some using white canes, picketed a state-owned blind workshop Wednesday protesting changes initiated by Lions Club officials.

A non-profit corporation composed of Lions Club members took over operation of the facility in July after signing a contract with the state.

"We were promised our full benefits and if we've lost that, we've lost everything. They say they've got to take our benefits in order to make the program work," said Ataska Armstrong, a picket.

The Mason Brandon Industries for the Blind, in West Nashville, employs 45 people to make mops, brooms and pillows.

"We feel like we're getting a raw deal between the state and the Lions Club," said

Janie Mooneyham, a 10-year employee in Nashville. "In the beginning when the Lions took over, they told us we wouldn't lose any benefits, but we have."

The employees say they want restoration of monthly and annual sick days and pay raises, which they say they have not received since the Lions Club took over.

Plant manager David Crowder, who declined comment about the pickets, said he will resign Oct. 2 because of the new policies.

Known for work in behalf of the blind, Lions Club members assumed management of the Nashville facility and have been engaged in contract negotiations for operation of A.P. Mills Blind Industries in Memphis. State officials said they could not make the workshops profitable.

Ed Lindsey of Lawrenceburg, president of the non-profit group, Ed Lindsey Blind Industries Inc., said the corporation is still working on policies for the workshops. A tentative draft of a policy manual is expected to be completed by early October, he said.

Lindsey is a past president of Lions Club International.

"The state situation in dealing with these blind people may have been more liberal than what you would say they are entitled to," Lindsey added.

The pickets carried such signs as "What Does the State of Tennessee and the Lions' Club have against the Blind?" and "We Want Our Benefits."

MORE PROGRESS FOR THE TENNESSEE VENDORS

AS NFB HELPS TO WIN NEW RIGHTS

As far back as the early summer of 1980, we began receiving calls in the National Office of the Federation from leaders among the Tennessee blind vendors. They were asking for our help, even though most held membership in the American Council of the Blind (ACB) and its front group for vendors, the Randolph-Sheppard Vendors of America (RSVA). These vendors from Tennessee came to us because their own organization had turned its back on them. ACB did not join the vendors in dealing aggressively with an uncooperative state agency.

But the vendors knew that Federationists do not cower before the agencies. We seek a relationship of peace and harmony based on equality, not oppression or custodialism. So, we agreed to help. In previous articles (see the *Braille Monitor* for November, 1980, March-April, 1981, and June, 1981), we have presented progress reports. Now we can round out the picture.

The Tennessee Committee of Blind Vendors, elected as required under the Randolph-Sheppard Act, consists of eleven members. These vendors are chosen to represent the operators located in designated districts throughout the state. NFB's assistance was formally requested by the committee in August, 1980. The problem was a set of program regulations that the agency had forced upon the vendors over Committee objections. There was an icy relationship between the state agency and the Committee. The agency was petulantly defensive. The vendors, on the other hand,

were on the attack. Among other things, the Committee had filed suit against the agency in an effort to scrap the entire set of rules and start from scratch.

It was at this point that the tide began to shift, as agency officials agreed to rewrite the objectionable rules and the Vendors Committee worked out a procedure for participating in this process. This included Federation help by James Gashel who served as an official consultant to the Committee. Negotiations were scheduled. These negotiations occurred in two parts which became known as "Phase I," and "Phase II." The first phase (including matters discussed extensively in our previous articles) was finally completed on August 24, 1981, when the state of Tennessee promulgated, as official rules, the agreements which had earlier been reached with the Committee of Blind Vendors and Mr. Gashel.

Now, we come to "Phase II." This involved additional proposals for amending the vending regulations. The important difference, however, was the fact that the vendors themselves, not the agency, initiated these changes by publishing their own "proposed rules." This, again, was done with substantial consultation and assistance provided by Mr. Gashel and other national leaders of the Federation. Negotiations on these proposals began in early November, 1981. The bargaining with agency representatives was hard. There were times when it appeared that nothing could be accomplished and all of our progress might be lost. Fortunately it was not. On October

31, 1982, the Committee of Blind Vendors approved the Phase II amendments which had been negotiated over the previous year with representatives of the state agency. This vote of approval by the vendors themselves was the last hurdle for the Phase II amendments. Now, only administrative formalities remain.

The changes include several new rights and options for the vendors. For example, one provision allows blind people in Tennessee to become owners of their vending facilities under a "manager-owner's" contract with the state, providing greater freedom and flexibility for the operator. Another feature allows any vendor to lease equipment rather than to depend upon the agency to provide and maintain state-owned equipment. In addition, vendors are given the right to handle customer and property management complaints without intervention by agency supervisors. Complaints about a manager will not be maintained in agency files unless each complaint is in writing and signed and the manager has had an opportunity to resolve the matter. These and many more provisions will change forever the way of doing business in the Tennessee Randolph-Sheppard Program.

These new rights were won through the process of "active participation" by the Blind Vendors Committee. Far beyond anything else, this is the most outstanding accomplishment. Participation by blind vendors in agency management decisions actually works. This is what Congress had in mind in writing into the law the duties of the Blind Vendors Committee. But, it is precisely the kind of thing that most state agencies for the blind have stubbornly resisted. The Tennessee agency was a leading force in this resistance. That has now been broken. There can be no question that this progress would not have been made without the participation and leadership of

the National Federation of the Blind.

The Phase II amendments include a definition of "active participation." It reads: "an ongoing process of negotiations between the state licensing agency and the Committee of Blind Vendors to achieve joint planning and approval of program policies, standards, and procedures, affecting the overall operation of the vending facility's program, prior to their implementation by the agency, provided that the implementation of agreed upon policies, standards, and procedures, affecting the overall operation of the vending facilities program, shall be subject to review by the Committee. It is understood that the agency bears final authority and responsibility for the administration and operation of the vending facilities program, including the assurance of continuing, active participation with the Committee of Blind Vendors." Although the language includes certain compromises, this definition outlines, as clearly as possible, the process used over the past two-and-one-half years during which Tennessee's Business Enterprises Program Rules have been completely rewritten. Now, the process itself, expressed in a definition, is a requirement of the State's regulations and must until changed, be used forever in the future.

Again, in the Tennessee experience, as is so often the case, we have an answer to the question "why the National Federation of the Blind?" For several years, the vendors of Tennessee struggled in vain to bring about agency responsiveness. Then, they turned to a national organization to which many of them belonged (the American Council of the Blind), only to find that ACB was in league with the state agency. The vendors could expect nothing from that quarter. Finally, they came to the NFB, their fellow blind who had organized to be truly independent from the agencies and capable of exercising a free choice.

Fundamentally, this decision to seek a relationship between the State Committee of Blind Vendors and NFB was the critical act. Now, rather than being faced by an unresponsive group of agency bureaucrats, the vendors meet with agency representatives who respect them as equals and deal with them as responsible human beings. The plain fact is that the agency simply has no other choice in the matter. Once upon a time, it may have been different, but no more.

As far back as 1971, when he delivered his annual banquet address at the NFB Convention in Houston, President Jernigan charted the course of our relations with the agencies and described the terms of our future dealings. He said: "Now, let me say something to those agencies who still look back to yesterday, who condescend to the blind, who custodialize and patronize. To them I say this: Your days are numbered. Once men have tasted freedom, they will not willingly or easily return to bondage. You have told us as blind people and you have told the community at large that we are not capable of managing our own affairs, that you are responsible for our lives and our destinies, that we as blind people must be sheltered and segregated—and that even then, we are not capable of earning our own keep. You have told us that we as blind people do not really have anything in common and that we therefore do not need an organization—that there is no such thing as an 'organized blind movement.' But you have not spoken the truth.

"If you tell us that you are important and necessary to our lives, we reply: It is true. But tear down every agency for the blind in the Nation, destroy every workshop, and burn every professional journal; and we can build them all back if they are needed. But take away the blind, and your journals will go dusty on the shelves. Your counselors will walk the streets for work,

and your broom corn will mold and rot in your sheltered shops. Yes, we need you; but you need us, too. We intend to have a voice in your operation and your decisions since what you do affects our lives. We intend to have representation on your boards, and we intend for you to recognize our organizations and treat us as equals. We are not your wards, and there is no way for you to make us your wards. The only question left to be settled is whether you will accept the new conditions and work with us in peace and partnership or whether we must drag you kicking and screaming into the new era. But enter the new era you will, like it or not."

The Tennessee experience exemplifies best the commitment of our movement to the principles which Dr. Jernigan stated so clearly over a decade ago. Today, the Tennessee agency, tomorrow, another state. Steadily, we march forward, for we are simply no longer willing to be second-class citizens.

And, what about Curtis Shepherd, the blind vendor in Chattanooga who, in 1980, led others in the state in standing forth against the forces of agency oppression? *Monitor* readers will recall that Curtis Shepherd was at one time the chairman of the legislative committee for the Randolph-Sheppard Vendors of America (the ACB front). But when his own organization failed to respond, Curtis adopted a different point of view. Well he should, and so should others. But Curtis Shepherd went further than most. He publicly resigned his membership in RSVA and withdrew totally from the American Council of the Blind (see the *Braille Monitor* for March-April, 1981). In taking this step, Curtis was joined by his wife, Betty Sue, who also resigned from another ACB front group, known as the National Association of Blind Teachers.

In June, 1981, Curtis and Betty Sue led in forming the Chattanooga Chapter of the

National Federation of the Blind of Tennessee. This was a first for our Tennessee affiliate, but there's more. On October 31, 1982, at the meeting which provided the final approval of the latest changes in the Tennessee vending rules, the Committee of

Blind Vendors also elected Curtis Shepherd as its Chairman. In addition to Curtis, other Federationists currently serve on the Committee. There is every promise that there will be harmony and cooperation in the Tennessee vending program.

OF COURTESY AND SWIMMING CLASSES

Jamal Mazrui is an active member of the National Federation of the Blind. He reads the literature, and practices the philosophy. He is also aware of our need to combat discrimination wherever we find it.

Public attitudes about blindness did not come into being in a single day. They are the product of traditions and beliefs which go back to the dawn of history. They will not be changed in a single day—but the events of each day (the small as well as the large) are important. In fact, the whole body of social belief and practice is nothing more than the product of the accumulation of daily events and occurrences. The following letter from Jamal Mazrui is one of the many daily events involved in the building of a new tradition and belief about blindness.

Princeton, NJ
October 28, 1982

Arlene Berman, Executive Director
Princeton Y.W.C.A.
Princeton, NJ

Dear Ms. Berman:

I am writing to register a formal complaint against the attendant at the pool desk for the treatment he accorded me on the night of my swim class, Monday,

September 27, 1982. I shall recount the events at length to clarify my cause for grievance.

I am enrolled in the "Swimmer" course, which began on September 20. I happen to be blind. On the night of the first class, I asked the desk attendant for directions to the Men's locker-room, since I was unfamiliar with the building. At that moment, another employee offered to accompany me to the locker-room, and I accepted, glad of the opportunity to become oriented to the place so that I would know my way in the future. In a few casual minutes the employee oriented me and I took note.

Thus, I arrived at the Y a week later, on September 27, expecting to make my way about in a smooth manner. What a surprise awaited me! The desk attendant confronted me with the question: "Now, are you really blind or are you carrying that stick [a white cane] as a joke?" Slightly taken aback, I replied that I was blind, and assumed the problem would be quickly rectified, perhaps even with an apology on his part. Instead, he lectured me in the following manner:

Well, the guy who helped you last week said you required special assistance to get to the locker room. You must receive this from him or one of two other

employees. If none of them are around though, you won't be able to go up to the locker room.

I explained to him that I had hardly required extended assistance the week before, and that I had learned the way now, so I could find the locker room quite adequately by myself. The attendant muttered some cynical, disbelieving comments under his breath. He then fired a question as if he had trapped me at my game: "Well, how come you needed help last week, but you don't this week?" Obviously, he had not paid attention to my last statement. I explained to him that I had needed directions that first night because the place was new to me; but, possessing a brain, I had learned my way, and now could go alone whether I could see the path or not. After some more mutterings, he asked me for my membership card as was standard procedure. I could not find the card immediately because apparently I had carelessly misplaced it among other cards in my wallet. Had he had any good will, the attendant might have glanced through my cards with me to help me identify the relevant one. Instead, he made a point of keeping his distance, and I heard him remark with satisfaction that I probably didn't even have a card—again in keeping with his notion that I was but a trickster. As my patience waned, some harsh though not profane remarks were exchanged. Fortu-

nately, a helpful onlooker succeeded in finding the right card for me. I duly thanked him, and left the card with the attendant for the duration of my class.

Class over, I stood to collect my card. The attendant grudgingly tossed the card onto the desk in my direction. Tossing rather than handing a card is casualness to the point of rudeness when dealing with customers. Moreover, in my case the act was also insensitive to my needs as a blind person.

To summarize, the attendant treated me not as a member, who deserved common courtesy and appropriate service, but as a rogue, an invalid, and an idiot. He harassed me, joked about me, and displayed uncommon insensitivity. In my experience to date, this attendant far from typifies the employees at the Y.W.C.A. However, his actions must not go unnoticed and uncorrected. I urge that the Y.W.C.A. take the following steps in response to this incident:

1. Review my letter with the attendant in question and obtain from him a sincere pledge that such behavior will not recur with me nor any other member.
2. Alert employees to the presence of handicapped minorities, and distinguish between real needs and those which are mythical.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jamal Mazrui

RECIPE OF THE MONTH

by *Ramona Walhof*

TUNA SALMON LOAF

Ingredients: 1 pound canned salmon (drained)
 1 or 2 (12 oz.) cans tuna (drained)
 1 or 2 cups cracker crumbs
 1 can cream of mushroom soup
 2 eggs
 1 handful minced onion
 parsley or celery if desired
 salt and pepper to taste

In large mixing bowl, break up salmon and tuna into small bits. Add all other ingredients and mix thoroughly. (For best results, mix with your hands.) Mold into one large loaf or two small loaves. Bake at 325 degrees for 45 minutes to one hour.

MONITOR MINIATURES □ □ □ □ □

□ Retirement Dinner:

Friends of Dr. T. V. (Tim) Cranmer held a retirement dinner in his honor at the Louisville Inn in Louisville, Kentucky, November 13, 1982. Dr. Cranmer, who has been one of the leading figures in the Kentucky state services for the blind for more than 30 years and who has also been an active member of the NFB during most of his life, was honored for the contributions he has made to the betterment of the lives of the blind. He is the inventor of the Cranmer Abacus and numerous other innovative aids and techniques to assist blind persons. Although Tim Cranmer is retiring from his official position with the state

agency, he is not retiring from his active role in the organized blind movement or his work to find new ways to help blind persons. We salute him as one of the leaders of our movement and as a pioneer in the field.

□ From Cherie Heppe:

"The Greater Hartford Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind has asked me to communicate to you the names of the chapter's newly elected officers and board. Our President is Mary Brunoli, elected to a second term. Our Vice President is Jackie Billey. Our Secretary is Cherie Heppe. Chapter Treasurer is Bruce Woodward, and the two board members are Gini Perlman and George Morgan. Reverend Howard May, Connecticut's NFB state

President, conducted the elections. As a newcomer to the state, I can say that I am enjoying my participation with my chapter and state affiliate."

□ From Al Sanchez, Secretary, National Federation of the Blind of Washington:

"Recently the Organized Blind of South Sound had its elections for the coming year. Our officers are: Robert Sellers, President; Ken Elfbrandt, Vice President; Linda Cosgrove, Secretary; and Rebecca Tiegen, Treasurer. Bob Sellers is a long-time Federationist, and it is going to be good to work with him."

□ From Brockton, Massachusetts:

National Federation of the Blind of Greater Brockton, Inc., Brockton, Massachusetts officers for the year 1982-1983 are: President—Martel Silba; Vice President—Douglas Campbell; Secretary—Donna Silba; Treasurer—Anne Prendergast; and Sergeant At Arms—Jack Carleton.

□ From Tom Anderson of Youngstown, Ohio:

"I want to cover matters concerning the visit of Diane McGeorge to Youngstown on Monday, October 11. Diane came back to Youngstown with us on a Greyhound bus at the conclusion of the NFB of Ohio state convention. I had arranged some radio, television, and newspaper interviews for her. I am sure that she reached over 500,000 persons in the tri-state area with the message of the Federation. And the people in the media were delighted with her, too. Diane had a fine interview with a features writer for the *Youngstown Vindicator*, our only daily newspaper. Diane had a very busy schedule on that lovely Monday, which was Columbus Day. She had a one-minute television news interview, a ten-minute feature television interview, a talk at a local Rotary Club luncheon, a feature

newspaper interview, and finally, two hours on a local radio phone-in talk show. While we were going around to the various radio and television stations, we checked into our Public Service Announcements. And I have also followed up with phone calls."

□ From New Jersey:

Jamal Mazrui has been appointed to the Consumer Advisory Board of the New Jersey Commission for the Blind. He writes: "The Trenton Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of New Jersey was reborn on October 25, 1982. The newly elected officers are: David Andrews, President; Jamal Mazrui, Vice President; Al Calvanelli, Secretary; and Agnes Allen, Treasurer."

□ From Peoples Drug Stores:

"Peoples Drug Stores has made Braille labels available on prescription drugs at all four of their 24-hour stores in the Washington metropolitan area, and at a number of additional stores in Maryland and Virginia.

"The new service, provided on request at no extra charge, provides a Braille label in place of a regular label affixed to prescription medicines. A second, printed label also is affixed to the medication, so that it can be read by sighted family members. . . .

" . . . Eventually, Peoples plans to extend the service to all of its stores. Peoples Drug Stores operate 558 stores in 14 states and the District of Columbia."

□ Symposium on Maps:

Professor of Geography James Goff, Mankato State University, Minnesota, sends us the following information:

"The Association of American Geographers, with co-sponsorship from the U.S. National Committees for the International Cartographic Association and the International Geographical Union, has

organized an International Symposium on Maps and Graphics for the Visually Handicapped, March 10-12, 1983, at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C.

"The role that maps and other graphic devices might play in enhancing the lives of visually handicapped individuals has become an important concern of cartographers, educators, geographers, and other specialists around the world.

"For further information about the symposium, get in touch with Patricia J. McWethy, Executive Director, Association of American Geographers, 1710 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, (202) 234-1450."

☐ From Mrs. tenBroek:

I can't turn up my copy of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but if memory serves, sanctions rest on the receipt of federal funds. This is, of course, true of § 504 though it is contained only in the regulations and the Executive Order.

If the federal government drastically reduces funds involved in social programs and those available to other involved institutions, what recourse would a client have in seeking redress of grievances?

Should enforcement sections of the Civil Rights Act be amended or strengthened in some way?

So much for reflections and ruminations on a fall day.

☐ Notice to AFB-ACB-NAC Combine:

After the national convention in Minneapolis last summer the board of the Montana affiliate voted to ratify the new Charter of Affiliation. Late during the state convention, one Sharon Cromeenes, who is a booster of the American Council of the Blind and an employee of the Montana agency, moved that the matter of the Charter be referred to a local attorney for an opinion and that the members of the

state affiliate be polled by mail ballot on the question of ratification. Mr. Cromeenes got his motion passed. He then sent to the attorney a packet of defamatory material concerning the Federation and its national leadership. This can only be regarded as an attempt by the American Council of the Blind to meddle in the internal affairs of the Federation and the Montana affiliate. The tactic backfired. The Montana attorney said that the new Charter of Affiliation was perfectly proper. By secret mail ballot the Montana membership overwhelmingly decided in favor of ratification. The vote was 147 yes, 38 no, and two ballots declared invalid. At a subsequent meeting the board of directors of the Montana affiliate voted to censure Sharon Cromeenes for his unethical conduct. These happenings in Montana may serve as notice to the American Council of the Blind, the American Foundation for the Blind, the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped (NAC), and all of the rest of that interlocking combine that we in the Federation are capable of handling our own affairs, that we do not appreciate their interference in our business, and that such tactics will (as the professionals are fond of saying) "impact negatively" when employed.

☐ Proclamation:

Mayor James E. Dyer of Danbury, Connecticut, proclaimed October 15, 1982, White Cane Day in Danbury. Among other things, the Mayor said:

"The city of Danbury, through the cooperation and assistance of the National Federation of the Blind of Connecticut, can look forward to a continued expansion of employment opportunities for and greater acceptance of blind persons in the competitive labor market."

☐ New York Convention:

The convention of the National Federation of the Blind of New York State was held in Syracuse during the weekend of October 11, 1982. The theme of the convention was: "The Future is Ours." The Charter of Affiliation was ratified; the Director of the Commission for the Blind spoke; and President Jernigan delivered the banquet address. Arie Gamliel was elected Second Vice President, and Joseph Varghese was elected Treasurer.

□ **Wedding Bells and the Continuing Struggle for Equal Treatment:**

Jim Ahearn, First Vice President of the NFB of Connecticut and Patricia Smith of Colorado Springs, Colorado, were married at the Stoney Hill Inn in Danbury on September 18, 1982. They plan to make their home in Danbury. As the following quote from the newspaper indicates, the newlyweds found no let-up in the struggle for first-class citizenship and equal treatment under the law. They have filed a human rights complaint. The article says:

"A newly married man and woman, both blind, have been turned away by a local landlord because they both have guide dogs.

"Local and state human rights officials say it is illegal for a landlord to reject a blind tenant because the person needs a dog.

"James and Patricia Ahearn said John Deep, of 60 Clapboard Ridge Road, told them he would not allow them to move into one of his six apartments on North Street because of the two dogs.

"Mrs. Ahearn quoted Deep as saying, 'I could tell you it's rented, but it isn't. I've got to be honest with you. We don't want any dogs, any pets.' "

□ **More Wedding Bells:**

Mike Hingson and Karen Dee Ashurst were married November 27, 1982, at the

University United Methodist Church in Irvine, California. It was a gala occasion, and we wish the newlyweds much happiness. Also, Roy Zuvers of Kansas City and Carol Clark of Iowa were married October 16 at the Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City. Federationists from throughout the region came to the wedding. They report that the ceremony was especially moving and beautiful. Roy is one of the leaders of the Missouri affiliate, and Carol is a long-time leader in Iowa.

□ **New Baby:**

Bill and Donna Munck of West Virginia proudly announce the arrival on November 14, 1982, of baby daughter Katrina Darlynn. She arrived at four o'clock p.m. and weighed seven pounds, twelve ounces. Mother, daughter, and father are all doing well.

□ **Suit Against IRS:**

The National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU) has filed suit against the Internal Revenue Service, in an attempt to remove the restrictions to advancement which have been placed upon blind persons hired as Taxpayer Service Representatives. The problem being addressed by NTEU and the blind Taxpayer Service Representatives is similar to the issue we faced with the Social Security Administration when blind people were limited to teleservice information jobs. It is a sign of our real progress to see a labor union (such as NTEU) stepping forward aggressively on behalf of its blind members. Several of these members are also active Federationists.

In order to support this effort, we need to provide the NTEU with as much information as possible concerning the number of blind IRS employees involved and the extent to which promotion opportunities have been denied. Accordingly, *Monitor* readers having information along these lines

should contact James Gashel at the National Office of the Federation. We won a major victory with the Social Security Administration, and now the battle is shifting to the Internal Revenue Service. Who will be next? Step by step we are marching toward equality. It goes without saying that the National Federation of the Blind will stand shoulder to shoulder with the NTEU and the blind IRS workers in the fight which is being waged. Wherever the blind face discrimination, there the Federation will be.

□ South Carolina Convention:

The National Federation of the Blind of South Carolina held its convention August 6-7, and Bob Bell of Laurens was elected President. Other officers elected were: Donald Capps, Columbia, First Vice President; Erlene Gardner, Aiken, Second Vice President; Bob Oglesby, Spartanburg, Secretary; and James Simms, Columbia, Treasurer. The meeting was well attended and extremely successful.

□ Charters Ratified:

As Federationists know, a new system of charters for state affiliates was introduced at the 1982 national convention in Minneapolis. It was agreed that the charters would be written as legally binding contracts and that they would not only be signed by an officer of the state affiliate but also ratified by the board or convention of each affiliate. The main North-South hall at the National Center for the Blind has now been officially designated as the "Hall of Charters," and as each state ratifies, a duplicate original of its Charter of Affiliation is hung on the wall in the Hall of Charters. All of the affiliates except one have now ratified, and we are sure that when the convention of that affiliate

occurs, it will make the roll call of states complete by being the fifty-first affiliate to ratify. Fifty charters now proudly hang for the whole world to see in the Hall of Charters at the National Center for the Blind. This is our answer to those who want to know what kind of organization we are and intend to be.

□ Jokebook:

Each month a presidential release is sent out from the National Office to all state and local affiliates of the Federation. By long-standing tradition each release ends with what some call a bit of witticism and others call by less flattering names. The presidential release jokes have now been collected into a book entitled **THE BELL, THE CLAPPER, AND THE CORD: WIT AND WITTICISM**. These jokebooks are available both in print and Braille at \$3.00 per copy. They make ideal gifts for either friends or opponents. Send checks and orders to the National Office.

□ Corporate Contribution:

October 18, 1982, from Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Minneapolis:

"The new IDS Community Involvement Program gives employees and their families an opportunity to decide where much of IDS's community support goes.

"I am happy to enclose \$640.00 which 'double' matches, because of volunteer involvement, the recent contribution of Curtis and Peggy Chong. We are pleased to be able to send the contribution now, rather than early in 1983 as you may have expected.

"We hope our support through matched gifts and voluntarism will grow and that a significant portion of our corporate contributions will be directed through matched gifts."

THE BRAILLE MONITOR

1800 JOHNSON STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21230

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
PERMIT NO. 7532